

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

ANTHONY CAIRNS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.)	
)	FILE No. _____
NO 1 BBQ KING LLC and)	
MSR VENTURES, L.P.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

COMPLAINT

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

ANTHONY CAIRNS, by and through the undersigned counsel, hereby files this, his Complaint against Defendants NO 1 BBQ KING LLC and MSR VENTURES, L.P., pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff ANTHONY CAIRNS (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Lewisville, Texas (Denton County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Defendant NO 1 BBQ KING LLC (hereinafter “BBQ KING”) is a Texas limited liability company that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

7. Defendant may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: Tariq Ismail, 110 South Greenville Avenue, Richardson, Texas 75081.

8. Defendant MSR VENTURES, L.P. (hereinafter “MSR VENTURES”) is a Texas limited partnership that transacts business in the state of Texas and within this judicial district.

9. Defendant may be properly served with process via its registered agent for service, to wit: Gerald H. Stool, 2808 Fairmount Street, Suite 100, Dallas, Texas 75201.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. On or about October 26, 2017, Plaintiff was a customer at “BBQ KING,” a business located at 110 S. Greenville Avenue, Richardson, Texas 75081, referenced herein as the “Facility.”

11. BBQ KING is the lessee or sub-lessee of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action.

12. MSR VENTURES is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that the Facility is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

13. Plaintiff lives in the nearby vicinity of the Facility and Property.

14. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 110 South Greenville Avenue, Richardson, Texas, Dallas County Property Appraiser’s account number 42430500250040000 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein was denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

15. Plaintiff has visited the Facility at least once before and intends on revisiting the Facility once the Facility is made accessible.

16. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Facility and Property to purchase goods and/or services.

17. Plaintiff traveled to the Facility and Property as a customer, encountered the barriers to access at the Facility and Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Facility and Property.

COUNT I VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

18. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

19. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and

communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and

- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

20. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

* * * * *

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

21. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

22. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

23. The Facility is a public accommodation and service establishment.

24. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

25. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

26. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993, if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

27. The Facility must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

28. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

29. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Facility and the Property in his capacity as a customer of the Facility and Property, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Facility and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein,

including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

30. Plaintiff intends to visit the Facility and Property again in the very near future as a customer in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Facility and Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Facility and Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

31. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Facility and Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

32. Defendants will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Facility and Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Facility and Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

33. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Facility and Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Facility and Property include, but are not limited to:

(a) ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- a. The doorway of the accessible entrance to Units 114 and 116 are not level in violation of section 404.2.4.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- b. There is an excessive vertical rise along the accessible route or path in violation of section 303.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property.
- c. There are no accessible parking spaces complying with section 502.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards in violation of section 208.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. **This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.**
- d. The interior of the Facility has a to-go/take-out counter lacking any portion of the counter that has a maximum height of 36 (thirty-six) inches from the finished floor in violation of section 904.4 of the

2010 ADAAG standards, all portions of the to-go/take-out counter exceed 36 (thirty-six) inches in height from the finished floor. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to properly transact business at the Facility.

- e. The Facility has a refrigerated section that lacks appropriate clear floor space in violation of section 305.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.
- f. Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.
- g. Due to a policy of storing highchairs in front of the men's restroom, the Facility lacks an access route to the restroom. Moreover, the maneuvering clearance of the restroom door is not clear, in violation of section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This violation made it difficult for Plaintiff to access the restroom.

(b) RESTROOMS:

- a. The Facility lacks restroom signage in compliance with sections 216.8 and 703 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to locate accessible restroom facilities.

- b. Restrooms have a vanity with inadequate knee and toe clearance in violation of section 306 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- c. The mirror in the bathrooms exceeds the maximum height permitted by Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This violation made it difficult for the Plaintiff to properly utilize public features of the restroom.
- d. The soap dispenser in the restroom is located outside the prescribed vertical reach ranges set forth in section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- e. The accessible toilet stall door is too narrow and/or otherwise violates section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for the Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.
- f. The height of coat hook located in accessible restroom stall is above 48 (forty-eight) inches from the finished floor in violation of section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to utilize the restroom facilities.
- g. There is inadequate clear turning space in the stall in violation of section 603.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

h. The restrooms in the Facility have grab bars adjacent to the commode which are not in compliance with section 604.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards as the rear bar is missing and the side bar is too short. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

i. The height of the urinal exceeds the maximum required height set forth in section 605.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

j. The paper towel dispenser in the restroom is located outside the prescribed vertical reach ranges set forth in section 308.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This made it difficult for Plaintiff to safely utilize the restroom facilities.

34. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Facility and Property.

35. Plaintiff requires an inspection of Facility and Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Facility and Property in violation of the ADA.

36. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

37. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to bring the Facility and Property into compliance with the ADA.

38. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Facility and Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

39. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Facility and Property is readily achievable because Defendants have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications.

40. Upon information and good faith belief, the Facility and Property have been altered since 2010.

41. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

42. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until

Defendants are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Facility and Property, including those alleged herein.

43. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

44. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants.

45. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

46. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants to modify the Facility and Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (1) That the Court find NO 1 BBQ KING LLC in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (2) That the Court find MSR VENTURES, L.P.. in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (3) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from continuing their discriminatory practices;

- (4) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the subject Facility to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (5) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (6) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: December 18, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

Law Offices of
LIPPE & ASSOCIATES

/s/Emil Lippe, Jr.
Emil Lippe, Jr., Esq.
State Bar No. 12398300
John L. Genung
State Bar No. 07804000
Lippe & Associates
12222 Merit Drive, Suite 1200
Dallas, TX 75251
Tel: (214) 855-1850
Fax: (214) 720-6074
emil@texaslaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF
ANTHONY CAIRNS